DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 399 774 FL 024 099

AUTHOR Iles, Zara
TITLE Collaborative Repair in EFL Classroom Talk.
PUB DATE Mar 96
NOTE 31p.; For complete volume, see FL 024 097.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Journal Articles (080)
JOURNAL CIT York Papers in Linguistics; v17 p23-51 Mar 1996

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Classroom Communication; Cooperation; Discourse Analysis; *Error Correction; Foreign Countries; *Group Dynamics; Language Research; Language Role; Linguistic Theory; Second Language Instruction
IDENTIFIERS *Repairs (Language)

ABSTRACT

Drawing data from audiotaped lessons with 10 native-speaker English-as-a-Foreign-Language (EFL) teachers and 12 EFL learners of varied linguistic backgrounds, a study explored some of the ways in which classroom talk by learners is collaboratively built to repair errors, misunderstandings, and non-communication. Focus is on both explicit and embedded other-correction, the least preferred form of repair in everyday talk, and the ways in which the recurrent features of repair in everyday conversation between native speakers are used in a different way in the EFL classroom, and how the forms of repair used by teachers reflect the nature and agenda of the teaching activity. A conversational analysis approach is adopted, emphasizing the negotiated nature of repair rather than segmenting conversation for analysis. Repair strategies are shown to impose different costs on the lesson agenda and the learners. Teacher approaches to repair include (1) restraining themselves from other-correction, (2) pursuing repair initiation to increase opportunities for self-repair, and (3) packaging other-correction in a "camouflaged" form, which tones down unmodulated other-correction and removes the focus from the activity of repair. Forms of correction are shown to orient to the pedagogical goal of the type of EFL lesson or activity that entails conscious attention to aspects of the target language. Contains 11 references. (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 399 774

COLLABORATIVE REPAIR IN EFL CLASSROOM TALK

Zara Iles

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Stephen J Harlow

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

FL021099

COLLABORATIVE REPAIR IN EFL CLASSROOM TALK

Zara Iles

Department of Language and Linguistic Science
University of York

1. Preface

This paper explores some of the benefits to be gained by adopting a conversation analysis (CA) perspective in an examination of 'English as a foreign language' (EFL) classroom talk. The EFL classroom is a context in which there is a heightened potentiality of problematic talk, e.g. errors, misunderstandings and non-communication. The need for REPAIR (Schegloff et al 1977) is therefore situationally endemic. In everyday talk, between participants who hold mutual assumptions of common ground and shared knowledge, repair has been shown to be an activity which is executed quickly as repair trajectories can necessitate certain interactional investments. EFL teachers and learners are differentially capable of dealing with and resolving trouble-at-talk situations because of the unequal knowledge distribution that exists between them. Some of the ways in which talk created by EFL participants is collaboratively built in order to address this particular state of affairs are discussed in this paper.

It is seen that differences in the agenda of the lesson at hand, e.g. involving a focus on language form or creation of conversation, are reflected in the interactional structure. Forms of correction are shown to impose different costs on the interaction, lesson agenda and for second language learners. Teachers are seen to be orienting to the status of other-correction as the least preferred repair trajectory (Schegloff et al. 1977), by a) pursuing repair initiation, b) withholding correction and c) adopting various camouflages which serve to downgrade the dispreferred activity of other-correction.

York Papers in Linguistics 17 (1996) 23-51
© Zara Iles

1.1 Introduction

This paper arises as part of a larger investigation which examines the ways, and the extent to which, matters pertaining to the development of language competencies are worked on by EFL teachers and learners in their talk. One such matter concerns errors and their treatments, one of the major businesses in which EFL classroom participants routinely engage. In spite of the fact that correction is an activity which is customary in the EFL context, "so little is known about the nature of correction as it occurs in the classroom and its effect on the learning process" (Pica 1994:70). Error and error correction are important in the characterisation of the nature of talk generated between EFL teachers and learners, and as such, a valid and accurate account of this aspect of EFL talk is of primary concern to second language acquisition (SLA) research.

In SLA research deciding on a definition of 'error' and identifying errors has proved problematic. An error is typically, and restrictively, defined as "the production of a linguistic form which deviates from the correct form" (Allwright and Bailey 1991:84); the correct form being that of the native-speaker 'norm'. Lennon (1991) concludes that:

> 'no universally applicable definition can be formulated, and what is to be counted as an error will vary according to situation, reference group, interlocutor, mode, style, production pressures' (Lennon, 1991:331)

A CA approach avoids such categorisation and analyses which result from an investigator's own intuitive understanding of what is happening in an instance of talk. It gives rise to an analysis which is based on observation of the orientations of the participants themselves in creating, and making sense of, their talk. The CA concept of repair allows for a broader perspective of error and correction than what is currently prevalent in SLA research. Repair is the structural and organisational mechanism in conversation that allows speakers to deal with troubles in speaking, hearing or understanding ongoing talk (Schegloff et al 1977). The term thus refers to a wider range of events than simply that of correction, which is just one possible realisation of

repair. Repair organisation offers all-inclusive and thus potentially more useful notions of the terms 'error' and 'correction', referring to all instances of problematic talk and the trajectories which are involved in its treatment. Construed in this fashion, errors can thus be seen as being more than the production of a deviant form by the learner, and hence specifically the learner's problem; errors and their repair constitute an interactional problem which EFL participants must jointly overcome, and which involves them in the regeneration of their talk after trouble or breakdown.

Repair entails making some aspect of language the focus of the talk to one degree or other, i.e. correction becomes the explicit activity of the talk or is a 'by-the-way-occurrence' and is dealt with swiftly (Jefferson 1987). Repair sequences are environments in which the identities of the participants as 'teacher' and 'learner' are made interactionally relevant and so manifested in the details of the talk. Repair trajectories are also environments within which knowledge (possibly new knowledge) about the target language is made available for the learner by the teacher. Language is demonstrated, experienced and worked on by both teacher and learner in repair trajectories. As will be shown in this paper, the structure and design of repair trajectories means that the extent of this 'working on talk' is negotiated. A detailed examination of these features of EFL interaction is therefore likely to yield important insights into the nature of second language (L2) development and the nature of its relationship to interaction.

This paper concentrates primarily on other-correction, the least preferred trajectory in repair organisation in everyday talk. Schegloff et al (1977) demonstrate that mundane conversation is 'structurally skewed' so that self-repair opportunities, where the originator of the trouble repairs his/her own talk, dominate over other-repair opportunities, where a co-participant actions the repair. Other-corrections are the forms of repair which Schegloff et al suggest operate as:

> a device for dealing with those who are still learning or being taught to operate with a system which requires, for its routine operation, that they be adequate self-monitors as a condition of competence. It is, in this sense, only a

> transitional usage, whose supersession by self-correction is continuously awaited. (1977:381)

The paper reveals how the recurrent features of repair observed in everyday conversation between native speakers, are employed in a 'specialised' way by participants in the context of the EFL classroom. It further reveals how the forms of repair employed by the EFL teachers, which orient to the maximisation or minimisation of explicit error correction, reflect the nature and the agenda (local and global) of the teaching activity. It also shows that the extent to which error correction becomes the overt business of the talk, or not, can, potentially, be controlled by both teacher and learner. For example, the design of teacher other-correction may serve to downgrade the activity in order to interrupt the ongoing talk as minimally as possible. Various camouflaging features drawn from observing teacher other-correction are highlighted in the extract analyses in section 4. The interaction in which EFL participants are engaged can be designed to either give priority to the business of 'creating conversation', or, the correction of talk and conscious analysis of the target language.

The account given in this paper is developed from observations made by Jefferson (1987) concerning explicit and embedded other-repair and subsequent projected accountings in normal everyday conversation. Examination and discussion of these repair trajectories is presented in Section 2. Instances of these two forms of other-correction from naturally-occurring EFL classroom data are described and discussed in Section 4. It is demonstrated that repair strategies adopted by EFL interactants can synchronously, a) attend to the nature, or expedite the achievement, of different goals to be attained in EFL lessons, and b) be sensitive to the linguistic, cognitive and interactional loads placed on 'less than fully competent' participants.

2. Exposed and Embedded Correction

Jefferson (1987) identifies and describes two forms of other-correction observable in everyday talk which have different interactional consequences; exposed and embedded correction. Jefferson demonstrates that correction by other-speaker is an activity which can either be a)

accomplished explicitly, where the correction becomes the interactional business, or, b) accomplished without it emerging to the conversational surface. Exposed correction has an interactional cost as the ongoing talk is interrupted and correction becomes the concern of the talk. It is demonstrated that with exposed forms of correction:
'correcting can be a matter of, not merely putting things to right ... but of specifically addressing lapses in competence and/or conduct' (Jefferson 1987:88).

After exposed correction, giving an account of error is potentially relevant. Exposed correction may therefore be a means of specifically bringing a participant to account for their errors. On the other hand, embedded other-correction is a way of handling problematic talk without invoking the apparatus of repair, i.e. initiation attempts, repair markers, hesitation, lengthy trajectories and so on, which lead to the successful, or otherwise, treatment of the repairable. Embedded correction does not project accountings and does not discontinue the ongoing talk. Correction does not become the interactional business and therefore demands less interactional investment, less time, and talk stays on topic. The following examples A-D from Jefferson's 1987 paper illustrate these two types of other-correction forms:

(Example A): Other-correction in next-turn with no overt markers (in line 1) and a minimal receipt of correction (in 2). The repairable item is picked out by Norm and an isolated repair, without surrounding syntactic context or explicit repair markers, is performed. The repair is imitated by Norm, marked with stress and acknowledged with an explicit receipt; 'Right'. The correction does not become topicalised, is executed quickly and so the talk is minimally interrupted. The redoing and completion of the repairing is signalled with a minimal 'M-hm' receipt from Norm who actioned the repair.

```
     Larry: They're going to drive back
                        Wednesday
1    Norm:              Tomorrow.
2    Larry: Tomorrow. Righ[t.
3    Norm                  [M-hm,
     Larry: They're working half day.
```

(Example B): Other-correction in next-turn with no overt markers (in 1) and an embedded receipt of repair (in line 2). No account of the error is given by Milly and she continues on topic. In next-turn after the trouble-source turn an other-correction is actioned by Jean. The repairable is isolated, redone without interval or explicit repair markers. The initial consonant is stressed and this is imitated by Milly in her subsequent redoing. Unlike in example A there are no acknowledgement markers of the repair activity from either speakers. The correction proceeds as a by the way occurrence and does not become the explicit focus of the talk.

	Milly:	...and then they said something about Kruschev has leukemia so I thought oh it's all a big put on.
1	Jean:	Breshnev.
2	Milly:	Breshnev has leukemia. So I didn't know what to think.

(Example C): An example of other-correction in next-turn with no overt markers (in 1) and an explicit receipt of correction (from 2 onwards). Jo actions the repair in line 1 without delay and without explicit repair markers. The repair is redone by Pat and she then maintains the repair as the focus of the talk by doing an accounting. Correction becomes the concern of the talk and there is some delay to the topic. The repair activity is made the source of a joke, which orients to the status of other-correction as a dispreferred activity and is a face-saving device.

	Pat:	...the Black Muslims are certainly more provocative than the Black Muslims ever were.
1	Jo:	The Black Panthers.
2	Pat :	The Black Panthers. What'd I
	Jo:	You said the Black Muslims twice.
	Pat:	Did I really?
	Jo:	Yes you di:d but that's alright I forgive you.

In examples A, B and C, the repairable is isolated in the correction turn i.e. there is no surrounding syntactic context. There are no explicit repair markers and the repair is imitated immediately by the originator of the trouble source in the following turn. The repair is executed quickly and there is little interruption to the ongoing talk. The examples also exhibit various behaviours by which participants acknowledge that repair is being accomplished, e.g., intonational highlighting of the repair elements and various minimal receipts. These same features are found in the repair sequences from EFL lessons discussed below in section 4. These sequences were taken from lessons or points in lessons where making correction the focus of talk is not the primary agenda. Explicitly packaged, exposed correction would interrupt the topic and potentially take over as the focus of the talk. The repair structure of examples A and B ensures that a) talk is repaired b) a redoing by the originator of the trouble-source is projected and accomplished, hence this can be regarded as an orientation to self-repair preference in the last resort, and c) the cost of repair activity to the interaction is limited.

The two forms of other-correction highlighted in the examples above do not correspond to two symmetrically distinct modes of correction. Correction may be explicitly actioned by one participant, but be accepted in an embedded form by the co-participant, thus ignoring the potentially projected accounting for error. Likewise, a correction may take an embedded form but be brought to the conversational surface by an explicit receipt. This phenomenon is illustrated in the following example in which participants deal with racist language.

(Example D): Other-correction in overlap (in 1) with explicit repair markers and embedded receipt of correction (in 2).

Jim:	Like yesterday there was a track meet at Central.Reese was there. Isn't that a reform school,
	(0.4)
Jim:	Reese?
	(.)
Roger:	Yes.

```
    Ken:        [Yeah.
    Jim:        [Buncha niggers and everything?
    Ken:        Yeah.
                        (0.3)
    Jim:        He went right down on that fie:ld
                like a nigger and all the guys
                (mean) all these niggers are a:ll
                [up there in- ]
1   Roger:      [You  mean  Ne]gro: don't you.
                        (.)
    Jim:        Well and [they're all-h-u]=
    Ken:                 [And  Ji:g,     ]
    Jim:        =-They['re they're A:LL up in the
    Ken:               [hunh stands you know       all
                        (.)
    Jim:        Th:gse guys (are) completely
2               radical.I think I think Negroes are
                cool gu:ys you knoiw,
    Ken:        Some of them yeah.
```

In the example above, Roger's exposed correction, in line 1, projects a potential accounting. But the repair is receipted in an embedded form by Jim later in the talk, in 2, thus avoiding having to give an account for his repairable. In this way, Jefferson argues, the activity of correction is shown to be a collaborative enterprise as it is through the participants': 'collaborative, step-by-step construction that correction will be an interactional business in its own right, with attendant activities addressing issues of competence and/or conduct or that correction will occur in such a way as to provide no room for accounting.' (Jefferson 1987:99)

In the EFL classroom context the capacity for this co-operative enterprise is potentially constrained. Second language learners may not be aware of the need for repair, let alone be in a position to action repair for themselves. Consequently, forms of correction may prove to have further costs for L2 teachers and learners. Exposed correction (initiation and treatment) and its accompanying activities can require the learner to focus explicitly and consciously on the form of the language s/he is

trying to learn. The learner may not be in a position to be able to meet these projected demands. On the other hand embedded forms of correction empowers the EFL teacher to attend to the repair of trouble-sources, but does not oblige an explicit of consciously motivated focus on language form. The L2 may, if in possession of necessary knowledge, accept the correction in an exposed receipt and even make the correction the focus of the talk him/herself. The continuum of repair and control of preference is negotiated as talk unfolds. For example, where the learner displays no awareness of error or inability to action self-repair in their talk EFL teachers may action other-correction in either an exposed or embedded form. (The employment of these structures is shown in section 4 to be indexical of the pedagogical agenda of the lesson). What is projected as a relevant next is therefore controlled, to some extent or other, by teacher and learner.

The extracts that follow reveal how types of correction are indexical of the agenda of the lesson and learner competence. They also show how various features in the talk of EFL teachers downgrade the activity of other-correction, the least preferred trajectory in the organisation of repair in mundane conversation.

3. Data

The extracts discussed below were selected from a corpus which includes data from audio-taped lessons from 10 native-speaker EFL teachers and 12 learners (of various nationalities). The lessons which were either described as 'conversation classes' or 'business English' took place in language units/schools in York and London. Teachers and learners were not informed of the express purpose of the study and the researcher was not present during the recordings. Factors such as age or sex of the participants were not a pre-consideration of the study reported in this paper and were therefore not controlled for the purposes of the study. Schegloff (1992) states that categorising speakers is only relevant when interactants themselves orient to such distinctions and can be found in the details of the talk. Such information would therefore only be brought to light after analysis of the data. However, some information about the learners and the language schools, where known, is given, and a brief description of the nature of each lesson.

ZLI:SFM:C1
A 'conversation class' at the University of York involving sixteen learners of various nationalities. This class which ran throughout a nine week term was targeted at overseas students and their partners who sought conversation practice. In this lesson the learners, in pairs, have been completing a gap-fill grammar exercise from a textbook. The exercise involves choosing the correct phrasal verb from a range of six possibilities. Extract 1 is taken from the point in the lesson where the whole class is collectively going through answers and correcting mistakes.

ZLI:SFM:GB1
A one-to-one 'conversation class' at the University of York involving a female Turkish native-speaker. The student was enrolled on a course of general English lessons prior to taking pre-sessional EAP courses before the beginning of the academic year. In this lesson the teacher and learner are involved in a discussion of images of Turkey after independently watching a television programme during the week prior to the class and discussing newspaper articles.

ZLI:SFM:P1
A one-to-one 'business English class' at a private language school in the city of York involving a Portuguese native-speaker. At the beginning of this lesson the teacher presented and explained various target sentences for 'comparing and contrasting' and 'giving opinions'. The teacher and learner discuss various statements given in their textbook, the learner's task being to give his opinion about what the statements suggests and to try to employ some of the target language previously given. Examples of statements are "business failure is due to bad management" and "high levels of unemployment will continue for decades".

ZLI:DC:G1
A one-to-one lesson at a private language school in London involving a German native speaker. The teacher and learner are discussing various topics, e.g., theatre, books, television. Some correction is actioned during the course of the conversation as errors occur, but 5 minutes is given over to highlighting errors and working through them at the end of the lesson.

ZLI:A:L1
A one-to-one 'Business English' lesson at a private language school in York. The learner is a French native speaker who is on a one-week course. The lesson was recorded on the last day of the learner's course and the activity in the lesson involves correcting sentences prepared previously for homework and reviewing new language.

4. Analysis of Data Extracts[1]

Extract 1: ZLI:SFM:C1

```
1   T: Horiyo can you read out what you've got
2      for that please.(*) the whole sentence
3   H: Mm hm the local supermarket has got up
4      the pri:ces again
5             (*)
6   T: °.HHHh now it's. ([*)        ] the verb
7   L:                    [unintell)]

8   T: is- yes something up yes
9             (*)
10  T: Now what do we sa- [(*)        ] not the
11  L:                     [(unintell)]

12  T: correct verb ([*)          ] no Forget get
```

[1] The notation employed in this paper is taken from Atkinson and Heritage (1984). Square brackets indicate the onset and offset of overlapping talk; untimed pauses are marked as (*).

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

```
14 L1:        G-et
15 L2:         -get
16 T: No Forget get p'
17 L: ((unintell))
18 T: What?
19 L  Put
20 T: We:ll done good
```

This first extract is from a lesson where language form and revealing linguistic knowledge is the explicit focus of the talk. Repair is therefore integral to the agenda of the lesson. The teacher nominates a particular learner, H, to make a public display of his competence. The learner provides an incorrect answer. The following delay. (line 5). and in-breath, dispreference markers at the start of the teacher's turn in line 6 signals inability to provide affiliative talk and that further work is needed. Another learner offers a possible answer (unintelligible to the observer). The teacher's turns from line 6 onwards involve repeated other-repair initiation and a marked withholding of other-correction. T highlights where the learners' attempts have been correct, "yes something up yes", in line 8. This initiation does not lead to successful learner repair. No possibles are offered by the learners. The teacher still does not action a correction at this point, but pursues initiation and providing clues. T proceeds to explicitly state that the learner's have chosen an incorrect verb. Further incorrect attempts are forthcoming from the class. In line 16, the teacher gives a further clue "p" to locate the correct verb - 'put' is the only verb in their list beginning with 'p'. The teacher's explicit initiation succeeds in enabling the learners to action the repair for themselves. Although the teacher has avoided unmodulated other-correction, the various steps in the repair initiation has demanded investment in the talk and of the learners' level of linguistic knowledge. The withholding of other-correction and involved repair trajectories to be found in this lesson echo observations made by McHoul concerning repair organisation in subject classroom talk. A regular pattern observed in McHoul's data was for the teacher to reformulate questions as further repair initiation and to provide clues to assist learner self-repair. McHoul concludes that "contrary to what may be a popular image of the classroom, teachers tend to show students

where their talk is in need of correction, not how corrections should be made" (1990:376). And in showing where, teachers indicate, of course, candidate 'whats'

Extracts 1, 2, 3 and 4 are taken from a lesson where creating conversation is the global pedagogic focus of the talk. The repair in the next extract involves the treatment of a single lexical item by the teacher after no display of error awareness by the learner.

Extract 2: ZLI:SFM:GB1

```
1   L: N n no not private (0.7) e:hh some beach
2      e:m
3              (1.9) (a)
4   L: are different (0.9) (b) than another
5   T: Uh hh.
6              (*)
7   L: °Than others° .hh and e:m
8              (4.1) (c)
9   L: U:hh .h
10             (2.8) (d)
11  L: Uh
12             (4.2) (e)
13  L: A:nd the beach .h e:hh intensive
14     tourists
15             (1.7)
16  T: °a lot of tourists°=
17  L: =°a lot of tourists° .h[h   e]:hh they
18  T:                          [hm mm]

19  L: (0.6) they can do easily
```

The frequency of hesitation markers in the learner's talk displays uncertainty about the coming talk. There are pauses and a marked withholding of help from the teacher, e.g.pauses (a) to (e) are potential sites where T could have provided affiliative talk or assistance. This lack of talk signals further work by L is required before alignment (Tarplee 1993). Note that in line 5, T does provide a minimal affiliative receipt, "Uh hh", but responsibility for speakership remains with L. (Schegloff

1982). The learner actions a self-repair in line 7. The learner's turn, lines 13-14, includes the repairable 'intensive'. A (1.7) pause follows representing an opportunity point for learner self-repair or repair-initiation. However, there is no display made of awareness of error or any repair attempts from L. The teacher actions a correction. The repairable is picked out and is redone as "a lot of tourists". In this correction, a) there are no explicit repair markers, b) no surrounding syntactic frame, c) no stress pattern to highlight the repair, d) an even intonation, e) it is quieter than the surrounding talk, and f) it is imitated by the learner in receipt, this imitation is pitch-matched. The repair is attended to by teacher and learner in a minimalistic way and does not become the focus of the talk. The learner does an imitation/redoing of the repair in line 17 and makes a claim for continuing speakership, ".hh e:hh they (0.6)". The teacher does a minimal receipt of the learner's redoing in overlap with this claim and also signals the learner's responsibility for continuing the talk, "hm mm" in line 18 (Schegloff 1982) In contrast to extract 1, the 'camouflaged' other-correction in this extract has economically and swiftly dealt with the need for repair and avoided potentially lengthy repair-initiation which could provide further problematic talk. The agenda of this lesson, in contrast to ZLI:SFM:C1, is creating and getting on with conversation and this is indexed in the design of the talk. Exposed and explicit forms of repair would have had a different interactional cost. Consider extract 3 below which demonstrates further camouflaging characteristics.

Extract 3: ZLI:SFM:GB1

```
1   L: A hat (.) u::h is belong- a hat
2              (1.0)
3   L: Is belong
4              (4.0)
5   L: Yes (.) to Gre- Greece.
6              (1.0)
7   T: So the hat comes from (.) Greece.
8   L: Yes Greece..
9   T: °Yes°.
10  L: Greece and e:hm
```

```
11              (2.0)
12  L: °Black°
13              (1.2)
14  L: °Clothes°
15              (1.0)
16      °Comes from°
17              (1.0)
18  L: E::i ehh (*) A- Africa.
19  T: °Right°=
20  L: =°Africa°.
```

The hesitancy, cut-offs in the learner's turns and pauses signal concern with the coming talk. The teacher refrains from assisting in spite of the various pause opportunities. The learner makes another attempt at completing her turn in 3. No assistance is requested from the teacher and none is offered. There is also a lack of affiliative talk from the teacher; no 'yes' or minimal 'hm' receipts. This lack of affiliation signals that further work is required (Tarplee 1993). However, after a 4.0 pause the learner explicitly displays her own assessment of her talk and she then completes her turn. A 1.0 pause follows and the teacher provides an upshot, a clarification request, of the learner's prior talk in line 7. The upshot a) displays, to the learner, the teacher's understanding of her talk, b) summarises the prior talk, c) projects the opportunity for learner alignment, or non-alignment which would project potential further work is necessary before affiliation, and d) is a candidate model. The learner does not action a redoing of the repair, but orients to the request for clarification by providing agreement (in line 8). Notice that it is not the specific repair element in this upshot that is intonationally highlighted in the teacher's talk; "So the <u>hat</u> comes from (.) <u>Greece</u>". The focus on the repair activity is therefore downgraded. Evidence to support that L has treated the teacher's talk as a repair is found later in line 16 where the repair is embedded into the learner's talk. The teacher's model is redone, but it is grammatically incorrect in this context.

In the following extract the learner requests help from the teacher and states the nature of the required assistance.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Extract 4: ZLI:SFM:GB1

```
1   L:  last year u:hh (1.0) pt .hh there was a
2       Turkish (1.0) Turkish woman (.) on the beach
3               (3.0)
4   L:  Very old and fat
5               (2.0)
6   L:  .h he heh an e::h without ((gestures around
7       chest))
8   T:  °A bikini top°
9   L   °A bikini top°
10  T:  °Hm mm°
11  L:  I- I'twas horrible
```

The repair in this fragment comes after learner request for assistance and thus an explicit display of lack of knowledge is made. In line 6 the learner pinpoints the target item with a gesture. The teacher's following repair is isolated from a surrounding syntactic context and is quieter than the surrounding talk. The repair is redone by the learner, it is also quieter than the surrounding talk and is pitch-matched. The teacher follows this ultimate learner self-repair with a minimal receipt which displays that the repair activity has terminated successfully, that no accounting is required and signals the learner's responsibility for on-going speakership.

Extracts 5 and 6 are also taken from a lesson where conversation is the global agenda, but target language has been specified for use. At the beginning of the lesson T has introduced several target phrases. In the extract below the learner requests assistance and the teacher actions a camouflaged repair. The learner's redoing is in overlap with the teacher's repair turn and further working on talk is necessitated in later turns. Repair is made the explicit focus of the talk.

Extract 5: ZLI:SFM:P1

```
1   L: =failure is (0.1) u:m (0.4) failure is
2      .hh I: think that is somesing (0.4) mm:
3      u:m somesing like what uh like um::: .huh
4              (5.3)
5   L: like I want to:
6              (2.2)
7   L: to win (0.3) uh::
8              (1.0)
9   L: a business and I I I I- and my- and the
10     conqueries- conquerency?
11  T: competi-tors
12  L:          -competit- competitance uhh
13     (cough) uh
14             (2.0)
15  L: could uh maybe (0.1) better than me
16             (1.0)
17  T: okay .hh so (*) failure is perhaps tne
18     opposite of success
19  L: yes (0.1) yes
20  T: the opposite -of success
21  L:                -yes
22  L: yes
23  .          (0.4)
24  T: okay yes remember the word competitors
25             (0.2)
26  T:  [competitors
27  L:  [competitors
28  T: y[es
29  L:  [competitors
```

This extract demonstrates how both teacher and learner may control the extent of focus on target language form and thus cost to the interaction. The learner's turns (lines 1-8 incorporate hesitation and pauses. The teacher withholds from assisting or affiliating talk and so leaves responsibility of speakership with the learner. In line 10 the learner

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

displays awareness of a potential problem with his talk. and also that he is unable to execute a repair by himself. L offers two possibilities, the second of which, (marked by question intonation), is oriented to by the teacher as a request for help and repair. The learner's request for help in line 10 is a minimally designed request from the learner and so in itself preserves the focus on topic rather than projecting a detailed digression towards corrective exchanges and explanation of the form of the language. The teacher's other-correction in line 11 also takes a minimal form as it attends to a recent correctable part of the learner's utterance and does it as a single lexical item. The activity of correction is downgraded by both participants. The teacher's repair has no explicit markers, is not embedded in a surrounding syntactic frame, is not highlighted prosodically and is imitated in receipt by the learner. However, on this occasion the learner does the redoing of the repair in overlap with the teacher's repair. The learner's redoing is incorrect, it is not an imitation of the teacher's model. At this point in the talk the learner is not brought to account by the teacher. The talk continues and the learner completes his specific, local goal at this juncture of the lesson; defining the word 'success'. In lines 17-18 the teacher does an upshot of the prior talk. The upshot, as in extract above a) provides an opportunity for learner alignment, b) displays the state of the teacher's understanding of the talk, c) projects an opportunity for further work to be accomplished if affiliation is not accomplished d) models a candidate target for the learner and so assists in the establishment of mutual comprehension between the participants. The learner provides agreement to the teacher's upshot. The teacher follows this with a redoing of part of her upshotting turn. The learner actions further affiliative talk. After the establishment of understanding, the teacher actions an explicit repair of the repairable "competit competitance" as the previous downgraded repair attempt failed and so correction is made the interactional focus. The teacher models the repair once again and this is imitated by the learner. The learner's redoing this time is acknowledged as being acceptable by the teacher with a 'yes' receipt in line 27.

In extract 6, below, the learner displays his inability to action a self-repair. After the teacher's camouflaged repair the learner pursues the correction activity because the repair is not the category he requires.

Extract 6: ZLI:SFM:P1

```
1   L:  look uh an uh (*) my company hadn't uh
2       hadn't uh:m subside o:r subside I don't
3       know
4   T:  subsidised
5   L:  subsidised subsidised
6   T:  hm mm
7   L:  subsidised but uh .h what a subsidise u:h
8   T:  subsidy
9   L:  a subsidy
10  T:  subsidy
11  L:  uh: subsidy of (*) EC o:r government
```

The learner explicitly displays that he is not sure about the word he wants (lines 2-3) and is not able to come to a decision about it himself. The teacher's other-correction takes a minimal form; there are no repair markers, no syntactic frame, and it is not highlighted prosodically and is imitated by the learner in receipt. The repair sequence is closed, as in Example A and extract 2 with a minimal "Hm mm" which signals the end of the repair activity, its successful accomplishment and that the learner has responsibility for continuing speakership. However on this occasion the learner is aware that the teacher's correction is not actually what he was searching for and the focus on the form of the language is maintained by the learner. The learner clearly signals the category of the repair that is being requested (in line 7); a noun is required rather than the verb form that was offered by T. This is evidence of real collaboration in repair between T and L. The teacher provides the required repair that has been explicitly sought for by the learner. The repair takes a minimal form once again. The repair is imitated by the learner and his turn proceeds. The teacher keeps the activity of correction to a minimum, whilst the learner who is in possession of sufficient knowledge is able to collaborate in this repair trajectory and maintain focus on the form of the language until the repair is successfully completed.

Extract 7 below illustrates the potential cost of repair initiation to the interaction, lesson agenda and language learner. For comparison,

example E below (Jefferson 1987) shows that between participants who share native-speaker competencies there may be little cost to the ongoing interaction. After a potential site for self-repair, (pause in 4), Louise initiates repair by identifying the trouble-source by repeating the repairable (line 5) with rising ('question') intonation. The beginning of the repairable is emphasised by stress, thus locating and marking the repairable. This initiation leads to a self-repair from Ken without delay. Ken overtly marks out the repair with stress. The extent to which the repair takes over the focus of the interaction is kept to a minimum, but both parties highlight their parts of the repair activity.

(Example E)

```
1  Ken:            Hey (.) the first ti:me they
2            stopped me from selling cigarettes
3            was this morning.
4            (1.0)
5  Louise:   From selling cigarettes?
6  Ken:            Or buying cigarettes.
```

Extract 7, taken from a lesson where teacher and learner are holding a discussion about topics such as television, books, actresses etc., illustrates the potential cost of repair to the interaction, lesson agenda and language learner. The language work accomplished in the sequence of talk in the extract above does not remain restricted to the replacement of one specific lexical item but is widened to include the displaying of grammatical and syntactic knowledge (concerning the use of 'since', 'for' and 'ago' when referring to points in the past).Therefore there are a number of potential acceptable repairs.

Extract 7: ZLI:DC:G1

```
1   L: I: u:m (0.4) pt read something about her an
2      interview last time I w-was here (0.2) in
3      London an:d she got oscars already and
4      since (0.2) two or three (0.1) years she
5      is a member of (0.2) parliament (0.2)
6   T: S[:ince ]
7   L:  [she be]
8   T: Since two or three yea:rs,
9   L: She: (0.1) since two or three years (0.4)
10     she has been
11             (0.3
12  T: No [stop] that was okay but y- b- sin:ce=
13  L:    [She ]
14     (0.2)
15  T: Two or three years
16             (0.2)
17  L: Since two or three ye:ar (0.4) she: has
18     been
19             (1.1)
20  T: (no re-) remember we wrote it=
21  L: =Hm: since two or [thr- (*)-
22                       [teacher writes on board-
23  L: Oh no for two or three years s:- sh: she
24     has been or is (.) uh?
25  T: >She has been<
26  L: Has been .h for two or three years she
27     has been a member of parliament [h      ]=
28  T:                                 [°Righ°]
29  L: =and she belongs to the labour party
30     (0.2)
31  T: Or if you use since you could say (0.1) she
32     h[as been
33  L:  [Sin:ce
34             (0.2)
35  T: Since=
```

```
36 L:  =Si:nce=
37 T   =Two years
38             (1.1)
39 L:  She has been=
40 T:  =s-heh-ince two y-heh-ears
41             (1.0)
42 L:  °Since° (*) °two° (*) years ago
43 T:  Yeh (0.1) yeah cause then y- [you're
44 L:                              [hm
45 T:  fixing it
46 L:  Hm:[m hm since two years ago she has been
47 T:     [ye
48     a member of parliament
```

The teacher attempts a repair initiation in line 6 which pinpoints the site of the repair "s:ince". The initiation fails to generate a successful repair from the learner who does a redoing of his previous talk. The learner proves unable to locate and action a repair based on T's repair initiation. The teacher withholds actioning other-correction and pursues further repair-initiation. T indicates that the talk redone by the learner is not problematic, hence the repairable is located elsewhere. In line 12 the teacher tries to initiate learner self-repair with a reiteration of the repairable 'since' again. The repairable is highlighted by greater stress on this occasion. The learner fails to action a self-repair. Later the teacher alludes to his assumption and belief that the learner is in possession of the knowledge about the target language under focus in this repair sequence as they have worked on this aspect previously; "remember we wrote it" (line 20). The learner is able to action a self-repair and overtly marks his recognition of the repair and realisation of the repair expectations by emphasising the repair element "for" in line? L continues with the local task of finishing the target sentence completion. However the attempt terminates with a quick request for help "uh?" (in line 24). An other-repair is actioned by T. The repair is isolated, but the speed of delivery is increased. The learner does a redoing of part of the teacher's model and after an in-breath does a redoing of the whole target sentence. The focus of the talk on repair and the form of the target language does not finish at this point. In line 31

the T sets up another sentence completion task for the learner but fails to generate an immediate successful learner repair. The repair is accomplished by the learner 11 lines later after repeated initiation attempts. The learner explicitly acknowledges the repair activity as the repairable is marked by stress ("ago" in line 42). The display of lack of knowledge in the learner's turns and failure to identify the repairable and complete a learner self-repair resulted in elongated initiation from T and several failed repair attempts by L. The pursuit of self-repair and withholding of other-correction in this extract ensured that repair became the local agenda and that the learner was forced to display his level of knowledge about a particular aspect of the target language. What happens in extract 7 clearly contrast with repair trajectories where camouflaged other-correction ensured that the ongoing interaction was minimally interrupted. The fact that the teacher had a basis for assuming the level of learner knowledge was alluded to in the talk and may explain his insistence on repair-initiation. Moreover, the repair required more than the replacement of a single lexical item.

Extract 7: ZLI:DC:G1

```
1   T: So it's difficult
2   L: It was (*) difficult=yes but I understood
3      it because I saw the musical
4              (*)
5   T: Because you saw the musical (*) or because
6   L: I (*) had seen
7              (*)
8   L: Had seen?
9   T: Yeah
10  L: I had seen the musical=
11  T: =Right if you hadn't seen the musical
12  L: I wouldn't=more difficult to understand
13             (*)
14  T: °Right°
```

The repairable "saw" occurs in (line 3). The learner makes no display of need for repair etc. After a pause (untimed) the teacher initiates repair.

He repeats part of L's prior talk, as in Example E and extract 7 above. The repair is followed by another pause. No repair is attempted by L. T then indicates the site of the repairable in line 5 with a sentence completion task. The learner actions a self-repair. The learner's talk displays uncertainty, a pause in line 6 mid-repair. The lack of affiliative talk from the teacher is oriented to by the learner as a display of a need for further work (Tarplee 1993). The learner does a redoing of the repair with question intonation displaying his uncertainty, but offers no other alternative repairs. The teacher provides affiliative talk in next-turn and maintains the focus on the form of the talk by constructing a sentence completion task which is successfully actioned by L.

Extracts 9 and 10 are from a lesson where correction is the concern of the talk. The teacher and learner are going through sentences written as a homework task. Focus on the form of the target language is an explicit pedagogical agenda in the lesson.

Extract 9: ZLI:A:L1

```
1   L:  Yesterday I kept witing do:wn my notes on
2       my carnet °un carnet u:h [I -don't know°]=
3   T:                           [no      n:    ]
4   T:  =Note?
5               (0.7)
6   T:  Notebook
7               (0.4)
8   L:  Notebook
9   T:  =Notebook
10              (6.0)
11  T:  Right?
```

The lesson activity concerns going through and correcting the learner's homework. The learner's task was to write sentences using specified new language that he has learned on the course. The learner reads out one of his answers (lines 1-2) and explicitly displays that he does not know the word in English that he needs to complete his sentence. The teacher makes repair attempts, which end in cut-offs, in overlap with L's turn. In line 4 the teacher constructs a repair-initiation as a word

completion task which fails to engender a learner self-repair. The completion task in itself promotes the activity as a collaborative enterprise. A 0.7 pause follows this initiation attempt and the teacher actions the projected repair; the learner's absence of talk signalling his inability to perform a repair. The teacher's repair is isolated, i.e. without any surrounding syntactic context, as were repairs dealing with the replacement of specific and single lexical items in the learner's talk as in extracts 2, 4, 5 and 6. The repair in extract 9 also generates an imitation by the learner. A difference is that the teacher's repair is highlighted intonationally. Focusing on the form of the language and correction comprise the activity of the talk displayed in extract 9.

In the last extract 10 below, there is more than one source of trouble in the learner's talk. This example is again taken from lesson ZLI:A:L1, where the activity of the talk concerns displaying competency and linguistic knowledge. Lengthened repair initiation , explicit focus on language form and the use of metalanguage characterise the talk as correction is an explicit agenda.

Extract 10: ZLI:A:L1

```
1   L: Are you sure we go to the wright die- di-
2      uh direction
3              (.)(a)
4   T: °Okay° .hh not we go: (.)(b) h imagine you're in
5      the situation
6              (0.7)
7   L: Uh we ri(de) -°no°
8   T:                 -Yeh bu- imagine=it's the tens:e
9              (0.4)
10  T: °Lori° =imagine it's now
11  L: Okay
12             (0.7)
13  T: Whi[ch tense would you] use=
14  L:     [Are    you    sure]
15  L: =We are going
16  T: Aright .hh okay an we are going=not to
17             (1.0)
```


BEST COPY AVAILABLE

```
18 T: Not the preposition is no[t to
19 L:                          [i:n the
20 T: Yes so say it again
21 L: Okay
22           (0.9)
23 T: Say the sentence again
24 L: Alors are you sure we are going in the right
25    de- direction
26 T: Yeh .hh i- uh Lori just say this .h are you
27    sure?
28           (0.8)
29 L: Yes
30 T: Stress the word sure
31           (0.5)
32 L: Are you sure?
33 T: Are you sure (*) we're going
34           (0.4)
35 L: In the wright direction
36 T: In the right direction
```

The learner reads out his sentence attempt containing the repairables, "go" and "to" in lines 1-2. After a micro-pause, at (a), signalling a coming dispreferred activity, the teacher receipts the turn and then actions a repair-initiation. The initiation identifies one of the trouble-sources. A micro-pause follows at (b) and the teacher provides further initiation, a "cluing" (McHoul 1990). After a 0.7 pause the learner attempts a repair but rejects his repair himself. The teacher withholds from other-correction and pursues further initiation. T explicitly states that the learner has used the wrong tense. The teacher provides two further initiations in lines 10 and 13 before the learner actions a self-repair. T receipts the learner repair in line 16. The teacher then directly proceeds to attend to a second repairable. The teacher's first initiation is minimally packaged and identifies the site of trouble, "not to". There is a one second interval and T continues with further initiation, avoiding other-correction. T highlights the repairable again. The learner actions a self-repair (line 19) and is requested to do a redoing of the repaired stretch of talk (line 20). The activity of the talk now turns to

pronunciation business with a sequence in which the talk focuses on intonation and stress.

The nature of the activity of the talk in this extract concerned overt focus on language form and correctness. The lengthened repair initiation sequence ensured that correction remained the explicit business.

6. Concluding remarks

The CA analysis of repair in EFL classroom talk reported in this paper gives testament to the nature of the joint management of issues related to second language development; issues connected with intelligibility, repairing troubles and establishing mutual comprehensibility and intersubjectivity. The description of one of the chief enterprises in EFL classroom talk generated by this CA analysis, is vastly different from the view of reactionary correction and appraisal, typified by 'initiation-response-feedback' routines, deemed to be paradigmatic of classroom talk (Sinclair and Coulthard 1975). Rather than segmenting EFL conversation into such uni-directional categories as initiation, response, teacher negative feedback, etc, correction, as part of the broader phenomenon of repair, has been revealed as an activity which is negotiated by EFL participants on a turn-by-turn basis as they collaboratively work on the re-construction of their talk.

Repair strategies have been shown to impose different costs on the lesson agenda and the learners. Teachers have also been seen to orient to the status of other-correction as a dispreferred activity, by a), restraining from other-correction, b), pursuing repair initiation to increase opportunities for self-repair, and c), packaging other-correction when actioned in an accommodating, 'camouflaged', (e.g. isolation of the repair, delivered at a volume which is quieter than the surrounding talk, and lack of intonational marking), environment which serves to tone down unmodulated other-correction and take the focus off the activity of repair. The 'camouflaged' corrections empowered the EFL teacher to attend to the repair of trouble-sources, but did not oblige a lengthened, explicit or consciously motivated focus on language form. As an example, extract 6, demonstrated that where the L2 learner is in possession of the necessary knowledge he/she may accept the correction in an exposed receipt and even make the correction the focus of the talk

him/herself. Repair and control of preference organisation is potentially actionable by both teacher and learner and is negotiated on a 'here and now' basis as their talk unfolds. For example, where the learner displays no awareness of error or inability to action self-repair in their turns-at-talk the EFL teacher may action other-correction in either an exposed or embedded form. What is projected as a relevant next is therefore controlled, to some extent or other, by the teacher and (subject to his/her level of competence) the learner.

Forms of correction were shown to orient to the pedagogic goal of the type of EFL lesson or activity in an EFL class which entails the conscious analysis of aspects of the target language, e.g. a grammar lesson, as in extract 1, 'correcting homework', as in extracts 9 and 10. These types of teaching agendas contrast with lessons or activities in which conversational practice is the global pedagogic goal, as in the discussions of extracts 2, 3, and 4. Explicit forms of correction and their accompanying accountings would require an investment in the talk and make demands on the learner which could prove to be beyond their level of competence. The extended repair activities of extracts 5 and 7 are examples where local agendas become relevant as the talk proceeds and so correction becomes the overt activity of the talk. In extract 5 the teacher actions explicit repair after a 'camouflaged' attempt failed. In extract 7 the teacher displays that he has good reason to anticipate the learner's capacity for self-repair.

This paper has examined the organisational devices which provide for flexibility, local-management and negotiation in the accomplishment of immediate and global interactional agendas in EFL classroom talk.

REFERENCES

Allwright, R.L. and K. M. Bailey. (1991). *Focus on the Language Classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Iles, Z. L. (1995). 'Learner control in repair in the EFL classroom'. Paper to be presented at BAAL Annual Meeting, September 1995.

Jefferson, G. (1987). 'On exposed and embedded correction in conversation'. In Button, G., and J. R. Lee (eds), *Talk and Social Organisation*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters. 86-100.

McHoul, A. (1990).The organisation of repair in classroom talk'. *Language in Society*. 19. 349-377.

Lennon, P. (1991). Error and the very advanced learner, *IRAL*. Vol XXIX/1. 30-44.

Pica, T. (1994). Questions from the language classroom: Research Perspectives. *TESOL Quarterly*. Vol. 28/1. 49-79

Schegloff, E.A. (1982). Discourse as an interactional achievement: Some issues of 'uh huh' and other things that come between sentences. In D. Tannen (ed.) *Analyzing Discourse: Text and Talk*. Washington D.C: Georgetown U.P. 71-93.

Schegloff, E.A. (1992). In another context. In A. Duranti and C. Goodwin (eds.) *Rethinking context: language as an interactive phenomenon*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 191-227.

Schegloff, E.A., Jefferson, G. and H. Sacks. (1977). The preference for self-correction in the organization of repair in conversation. *Language*. 53. 361-382.

Sinclair, J. and M. Coulthard. (1975). *Towards an analysis of discourse*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Tarplee, C. (1993). 'Working on Talk: the collaborative shaping of linguistic skills within child-adult interaction'. *Unpublished DPhil thesis*. University of York.